1	DAYLE ELIESON			
2	United States Attorney ALEXANDRA MICHAEL			
3	PATRICK BURNS Nevada Bar No. 11779			
4	Assistant United States Attorneys 501 Las Vegas Boulevard South, Suite 1100			
5	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 388-6336/Fax: (702) 388- 6020			
6	John.P.Burns@usdoj.gov			
7	Representing the United States of America			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA			
9	-oOo-			
10	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	Case No.: 2:15-cr-00014-APG-VCF		
11	Plaintiff,	GOVERNMENT'S MOTION IN LIMINE REGARDING COURTROOM		
12	vs.	PROCEDURES WITH PRO SE		
13	OMAR QAZI,	DEFENDANT		
14	Defendant.			
15	CERTIFICATION: The undersigned counsel certifies that this Motion is timely filed.			
16	The United State of America, by and through DAYLE ELIESON, United States			
17	Attorney, and ALEXANDRA MICHAEL and PATRICK BURNS, Assistant United			
18	States Attorneys, hereby respectfully submit this Government's Motion In Limine			
19	Regarding Courtroom Procedures with Pro Se Defendant.			
20	111			
21	111			
22	111			
23	111			
$_{24}$				

# POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

## \_

### I. <u>Introduction</u>

Defendant Omar Qazi (Qazi) is charged in a one-count indictment with being a convicted felon in possession of a firearm in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g). Qazi's DNA was found on the subject firearm and he gave a recorded confession admitting his guilt. Based on his custody status and history of failing to conduct himself in a professional and safe manner while in court, see, e.g., ECF No. 375 at 41-46 (Qazi engaging in violent outburst while referring to AUSA by her name and as a "punk ass bitch"), it is anticipated that Qazi may be required to remain shackled throughout the trial proceedings. Ordinarily, in order to ensure that the jury does not see a defendant's shackles, a drape is placed around the counsel table. In addition, if a defendant does not waive his presence at sidebar discussions, those issues are resolved when the Court is

on recess and outside the presence of the jury. However, in this case, there are additional

issues that will arise given Qazi's election to represent himself.

Ordinarily, attorneys present their opening and closing statements by standing at a podium. Attorneys question witnesses, during both direct and cross examination, by standing at a podium. In each instance, the attorneys must move to and from counsel table. In addition, attorneys may have occasion to walk exhibits to either the court clerk or the witness. However, in this case, each of these actions has the potential to reveal that Qazi is shackled and in custody. In addition, Qazi's custody status might also be revealed during sidebar meetings with the Court following objections that must be resolved outside the presence of the jury. As a result, there are a number of courtroom procedures that may be impacted by Qazi's custody status — particularly if he remains

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

shackled. The Government requests that, if the Court orders Qazi shackled during trial, that the Court enter an order in limine implementing courtroom procedures and protocols to ensure Qazi's due process rights are not violated and to provide guidance to the parties.

5

### II. Legal Argument

Whether a defendant will be required to be shackled during a trial is within the

6

#### A. Due Process Does Not Permit The Use Of Visible Restraints

discretion of the district court. United States v. Cazares, 788 F.3d 956, 963 (9th Cir.

2015). In exercising this discretion, the district court must: (1) be persuaded by

compelling circumstances that some measure is needed to maintain the security of the

courtroom; and, (2) pursue less restrictive alternatives before imposing physical

restraints. Id. Whether Qazi will be required to be shackled during this trial will be a

decision within the Court's discretion. Here, Qazi has a lengthy criminal history,

including felony and misdemeanor convictions for violent crime. He has demonstrated a

propensity for violence during court proceedings, verbally threatened an AUSA, and

generally demonstrated a lack of respect for the authority of multiple federal judges.

Thus, it appears that there are sufficiently compelling circumstances that may require

"some measure" to "maintain security in the courtroom." Id. The Government is

unaware, what, if any, less restrictive alternatives can be imposed short of physical

restraints to maintain the courtroom security. This is a question best posed to the United

States Marshals Service Deputies, who are experts at courtroom security.<sup>1</sup>

7 8

9

1011

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Government takes no position on whether Qazi should or should not be shackled.

2
 3

However, if Qazi is shackled, "due process does not permit the use of visible restraints if the trial court has not taken account of the circumstances of a particular case." *Id.* (quoting *Deck v. Missouri*, 544 U.S. 622, 632 (2005). The reason for this is simple: "visible shackling undermines the presumption of innocence and the fairness of the fact finding process." *Id.* For these reasons, in the presence of the jury, defendants are usually not handcuffed or placed in other visible restraints. *Id.* (citing *Stewart v. Corbin*, 850 F.2d 492, 497 (9th Cir. 1988).

In this case, if Qazi is shackled during trial, there must be measures taken to ensure that Qazi's shackles are not seen by the jury and his due process rights are not violated. This will be particularly important and unique given that Qazi is representing himself. Accordingly, there must be measures taken to ensure that Qazi will still be able to have control over the organization of his defense, make motions, participate in voir dire, question witnesses and the like. See McCaskle v. Wiggins, 465 U.S. 168, 174 (1984). In order to ensure that Qazi's due process rights are not violated and that his restraints are not seen, the Government offers the following protocols to be implemented at the time of trial:<sup>2</sup>

This is a decision that is best left to the discretion of the Court and based upon information received from court security experts. This motion is made in an abundance of caution in anticipation of the possibility that Qazi will be shackled during the proceedings.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> These are only suggestions by the Government and are not intended to be an exhaustive list. Rather, the Government expects that the Court may have utilized similar or additional protocols in previous cases. The protocols listed here are only suggestions to ensure that the trial is fair and just to all parties.

III. Conclusion For the foregoing reasons, the Government respectfully requests that the Court enter an order in limine adopting the above protocols, and such other protocols as the Court sees fit, if Defendant Qazi is shackled during the trial. DATED this 5th day of July, 2018. Respectfully submitted, DAYLE ELIESON United States Attorney //s// ALEXANDRA MICHAEL PATRICK BURNS Assistant United States Attorneys 

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
2	I certify that I am an employee of the United States Attorney's Office. A cop	y of
3	the foregoing GOVERNMENT'S MOTION IN LIMINE REGARDS	ING
4	COURTROOM PROCEDURES WITH PRO SE DEFENDANT was sent	t to
5	Defendant Qazi via United States mail addressed to:	
6 7	Mr. Omar Qazi #49760048 NSDC 2190 East Mesquite Avenue Pahrump, Nevada, 89060	
8	and on stand-by counsel Telia Williams, Esq., via electronic service by ECF, on Ju	ly 5.
9	2018.	
10		
11	<b>DATED</b> this 5th day of July, 2018.	
12	/ s / Patrick Burns	
13	PATRICK BURNS	
14	Assistant United States Attorney	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		